



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation District	County	Butte
Project Title	Identification and Evaluation of Groundwater Recharge in Butte County	Grant Request	\$ 249,472.96
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,472.96

Project Description: The proposed project creates a county-wide map identifying areas based on their groundwater recharge potential. The purpose of this map is to provide technical assistance to local land management planners to fulfill obligations to protect groundwater recharge areas.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	28

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported with the submittal of the 2004 GWMP and resolution of county adoption. The Butte County Board of Supervisors adopted the Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation GWMP on September 28th, 2004 with Resolution No. 04-181.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The application contains a detailed description of the proposed project including the goals of the project (page 1), needed background information, (Section E, Baseline Data and Current Conditions), and location and area affected (Tasks 2 and 3 beginning on page 16). The level of detail was sufficient to determine that the proposed project is technically feasible. Although a detailed summary of the Butte County GWMP Project was given (Section D on page 7) it was not made clear how collaboration would take place with other local public agencies with regard to the project, other than a general statement at the end of the section on page 9. It was not made clear in the project description how a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management would be obtained beyond the models already described.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The work plan is consistent with the budget and schedule. The tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal as stated in the Project Description and Work Plan. Progress evaluation and deliverables are listed after each Task. What is missing is how the three primary tasks identified in the work plan relate to one another in terms of work flow, critical path and dependencies. Also, there was no indication or assurance that access to private property would be granted for Task 3. Permitting requirements were not discussed. There were no specifics in the tasks as to how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule. However, there was limited explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the labor costs and no job titles or descriptions. No cost assumptions were provided. The explanatory text footnotes were incomplete or do not support budget amounts. There were no details on material expenses or what is included in the consultant budget. There was also no indication as to whether there were matching costs.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule. However, there was limited explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the labor costs and no job titles or descriptions. No cost assumptions were provided. The explanatory text footnotes were incomplete or do not support budget amounts. There were no details on material expenses or what is included in the consultant budget. There was also no indication as to whether there were matching costs.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Personnel qualifications are not described and procedural assurances are vague (e.g. “the development of the countywide groundwater recharge map will be brought to the Water Commission at key junctures for comment and input”). No standardized methodologies are described for possible water analyses. The QA/QC plan description is very general. The Geophysical Survey methodology does not have details as to which parameters in Tasks 1 and 2 it would pertain to.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant provided a summary of work completed that is comparable to the proposal. Backup information is included in the form of a Department of Finance Audit Report for two of the projects which showed that the work was successfully completed. However the Report cited some inadequacies regarding consultant hours tracking. There is no evidence that the budgets and schedules were successfully managed. More documentation was needed